

Economic Peace Making

P. MAURICE HILL

Reprinted from A Catholic Survey (London).

WHEN at 11 o'clock on November 11, 1918, the order was given to cease fire, we imagined that the war was finished. But for all that war has remained with us. The struggle was transferred from the military to the economic field. Today we stand on the edge of the abyss. To quote a Resolution adopted by the Council of the International Chamber of Commerce last October: "Conditions in every country become daily more critical, confidence wanes, commerce stagnates, unemployment spreads and enterprise is paralyzed."

The Holy See called attention to these conditions in the encyclical "Ubi Arcano Dei" of 1922, in the following words:

Neither to individuals nor to society nor to the peoples has come true peace after the disastrous war; the fruitful tranquillity for which all long is still wanting . . . wonderfully adapted to our days are the words of the Prophet "We looked for peace and no good came; for a time of healing and behold fear."

There is urgent need of Economic Peacemaking to achieve "the Peace of Christ in the Kingdom of Christ." For this, however, we must face the economic difficulties. There are four great Dilemmas:

FIRST.—*The Disarmament Dilemma.* Disarmament is necessary, but dare the countries seriously disarm with Russia in the background waiting to strike and creating an industrial machine which can one day be turned to the uses of war?

SECOND.—*The Reparations Dilemma.* Reparations can only be paid at the price of promoting economic competition of German exports with those of the Allied Countries. We in Great Britain have had to pay two-and-a-half million people not to work in order that France and the United

States should receive Reparations from Germany. That is the price we have paid for the Peace Treaty.

THIRD.—*The Debts Dilemma.* The war debts of the Allies consume each other in a vicious circle. Germany can only pay France if the U. S. A. lends her the money. France can only pay England if she receives reparations from Germany. England can only pay the U. S. A. if she can send her gold, goods, or services, but the U. S. A. cannot afford to take payment in goods at the expense of her own manufacturers.

FOURTH.—*The Tariff Dilemma.* All countries have an exportable surplus and must import the complements of what they export. All have developed populations which can only be fed and clothed if international trade is maintained. The conditions under which any country could even survive as a self-contained unit have disappeared. Yet the more dependent each country becomes on the exchange of goods and services the more do they put every obstacle in the way of such exchange, in a blind desire for self-contained isolation.

In 1914 tariffs were meant and adapted to give reasonable protection to the manufacturer in the home market and to provide revenue. From 1920 onwards they have increased out of all reason, and the unconscious effect has been not so much to protect national trade as to bring international trade to a standstill. The two policies of selling freely and refusing to buy are incompatible, and persistence in these two opposed policies is destroying the fabric of world trade. It is stalemate. The machine of trade has almost come to a complete standstill. Its mighty wheels revolve feebly and uncertainly, and the mechanics of all countries look on and wonder how long it will be before they cease to revolve, and what power can start them up again. And all the time there is Russia in the background.

We know that Russia's grand objective is World Revolution, but before she can ruin civilization she must break its strength, and she has realized that the way to break it is by undermining the economic basis of its life. So she starves her people to pour grain into the markets of the world, to force down the price and cause unemployment and social unrest in the agricultural countries. She forces her worker to produce manufactures which she then launches on

the word's markets at prices below the cost of the raw material, to paralyze industry and create unemployment and social unrest in industrial countries.

The pale of civilization is growing thin and brittle. The barbarians, like wolves, ranged the forests of the north outside the pale of the Roman Empire before they broke in and overwhelmed it. The new barbarians of today in the forests further north have the weapons of civilization at their command.

The parallel of modern civilization with the Roman Empire goes deeper than externals. For, as Rome decayed and perished from moral dissolution, so the causes of the decay which threatens the modern world are ultimately up with questions of Faith, for loss and perversion of the faith have produced the moral evils which are responsible for the political and economic evils of our age. We may analyze the chain of causes:

FIRST.—The refusal of States to accept the authority of the moral law in their actions—the rejection of the guidance of the Church in applying this law to political life.

SECOND.—The rise of excessive Nationalism creating political and economic rivalry between States.

THIRD.—The conception of the Lay State—laicism—the penetration of secular and anti-religious influences into the life of peoples.

FOURTH.—The Reformation which fostered the growth of materialism.

FIFTH.—Unbridled materialism—greed—increasing steadily through the XIX Century—producing social unrest and intensifying economic rivalry between nations which culminated in the Great War, and which caused the Allies to create money debts in respect of services which should have been given freely in the common cause.

SIXTH.—The conquest of passion over reason which made the Belligerents in the Great War deaf to the appeals of the Holy See to make peace while there was yet time to repair the moral and material damage done; and

FINALLY.—*An unjust and unwise peace*; unjust because it was vindictive and without charity; unwise, because it has ruined the victors as much as the vanquished. It thus intensified the economic struggle which has led to the race of tariffs and brought trade to a standstill. And it has thereby

created vast unemployment, misery, unrest, and, for many, despair.

The principles of Economic Peace-making have been exhaustively declared by the Holy See in that wonderful series of pronouncements beginning with the "Rerum Novarum" in 1851, and of which the latest are those of the present Pope on the Social Order and the Economic Crisis in 1931. It will be of advantage here to recall the broad outlines of these various Encyclicals.

We start from the conclusion:

Social reconstruction must be preceded by a profound renewal of the Christian spirit. . . . If society is to be healed . . . in no way can it be healed save by a return to Christian life and Christian institutions . . . rationalization of economic life which will introduce sound and true order . . . which regards created goods as mere instruments under God . . . if these principles be observed by all, everywhere and at all times, not merely the production and acquisition of goods, but also the use of wealth . . . will be brought back again to standards of equity and just distribution.

Based on these principles economic reconstruction should be informed by justice and still more by charity the "bond of perfection," and should proceed on the lines of:

(1).—*A wider distribution of private property*, the necessity and justice of which is upheld.

(2).—*The cooperation of capital and labor and of each among themselves*, not only in the settlement of the "just wage" and of conditions of work, but with a broader view to the success of the business in which both are engaged as natural partners, on a basis of "mutual understanding and Christian harmony."

(3).—*The establishment of vocational groups*—"the common effort of employers and employees of one and the same group joining forces to produce goods or give service . . ." and all groups uniting to promote the common good which will be assured "in proportion to the fidelity with which individuals and groups discharge their professional duties and excel in them."

(4).—*The definite rejection of extreme socialism and communism*, unjust in their philosophy and most certainly illusory in their promises.

(5).—*The substitution of mutual charity for class warfare*.

(6).—*The recognition by the State* of a double duty on the one hand to "make the whole of human society conform to the common good"—including the uplifting of the proletariat, "and the protection of the weak" and, on the other, not to encroach upon the natural and moral rights of the individual.

(7).—*The penetration* of individuals and of the institutions of society by the sense of religious duty.

(8).—*Economic cooperation* between nations "by prudent pacts and institutions" in place of economic warfare.

In view of the importance today of the problem of debts and reparations we may add the words of Benedict XV in his peace proposals of 1917. "We see no way to solve the question save by laying down as a general principle complete and reciprocal condonation."

Such are the principles. The Holy See has testified to the progress that has already been made towards realizing them. The world has travelled far towards social justice since 1851. In the sphere of international economic adjustment there has also been progress since the War. The Economic Section of the League of Nations and the International Chamber of Commerce have together done good work, especially in regard to finance and communications. Indeed, the financial work of the League has a special significance today not only for what it has achieved, but because it has dealt with problems which are in part those we are now up against.

This work is represented by two main achievements (1) the Brussels Conference of 1920 which told the nations, among other things, to balance their budgets and stop inflation and (2) the Reconstruction of Austria. The words of the Financial Committee's report on the occasion are ominous for ourselves in like condition: "The alternative is not between continuing the conditions of life last year or improving them. It is between enduring greater hardship . . . or collapsing into a chaos of destitution and starvation."

The problem of tariff warfare was the main subject of the Economic Conference at Geneva in 1927. The Conference, which was composed indiscriminately of protectionists and free-traders, came to a unanimous conclusion that—"The time had come to put an end to the upward movement in tariffs and to move in the opposite direction." It inspired

the late M. Briand with the idea of an Economic Federation of European States. This was followed by an attempt to abolish import and export prohibitions and by the abortive Tariff Truce.

It is on the high seas that economic cooperation has achieved its greatest successes. The "Freedom of the Seas" from economic warfare by one nation against the shipping of another was secured by the Maritime Ports Convention in 1923. This Agreement checked a dangerous reaction towards discrimination which was on the point of breaking out both in America and Europe.

The International Chamber of Commerce has played a part of increasing responsibility and importance in Economic Peace-Making. It has been behind the scenes in all the great international attempts to promote international cooperation and disarmament. Many of the principles now generally accepted were first suggested by them, and many of the steps taken to improve the world owe their inspiration to this source. Thus they were behind the Brussels Financial Conference and the Dawes and Young Plans, and it was they who first sketched the Ter Meulen Scheme for International Credit. They have consistently urged the free circulation of capital, cooperation between capital and labor, and the need for a just and a final solution of the problems of reparations, debts and exchanges. Their Report on Trade Barriers became the textbook of the Economic Conference in 1927. The League now recognize them as the mouthpiece of the business world, and consult them on all economic matters.

In conclusion it may be said that the central problem today is moral and psychological—the restoration of confidence. This runs through all the other problems. The efforts which have been described help to promote confidence, but it can only be permanently restored if the economic order is reconstructed on the principles proclaimed by the Church. In approaching that task, which must be long and laborious, we ourselves have need of confidence. "Let not your heart be troubled—seek first the Kingdom of God and His justice and all these things will be added to you."

Caesarism, Conscience, and War

JOSEPH KEATING, S.J.

Reprinted from the Month (London), July, 1932.

IN his recent Encyclical, "Caritate Christi Compulsi," the Pope once more distinguishes between patriotism "controlled, sanctified and animated" by Christian charity, and the same virtue, escaped from Christian control and become the vice of nationalism. And he implies that the latter vice is simply a development of personal pride, the fruitful source of international disorders.

If [he writes] egoism, abusing this love of country and exaggerating this sentiment of nationalism, insinuates itself into the relations between people and people, there is no excess that will not seem justified; and that which, between individuals, would be judged blame-worthy by all, is now considered lawful and praiseworthy if it is done in the name of this exaggerated nationalism. Instead of the great law of love and human brotherhood, which embraces and holds in a single family all nations and peoples with one Father who is in heaven, there enters hatred, driving all to destruction.

Past history and present, nay, the actual stumbling efforts to reach international harmony now being made, are an eloquent commentary on this clear restatement of Christian doctrine, which has been the burden of many Papal utterances. Thirty years ago, Pope Leo XIII spoke to the same effect:

The repudiation of Christian principles, those principles which are so powerfully effective in cementing the brotherhood of peoples and in uniting the whole human race in a kind of immense family, has gradually produced in the international order a system of jealous egoism, in consequence of which the nations regard one another, if not always with hatred, at least with the distrust which animates rivals.

The repudiation of Christian principles — justice, brotherly love, patience, mercy, prudence and the like—of which the Popes speak, results from the progressive disbelief in any God-appointed source of moral teaching amongst

men, the formal alienation of the mind of the "secular" State from the influence of the Church, even from those fragmentary presentments of Christianity embodied in the "Churches." Although religion is still officially recognized in a few modern States, there is no Government, except perhaps the Fascist regime in Italy, which acknowledges itself bound in practice to rule and legislate in accordance with the laws of the Church. Secularism is prevalent everywhere, and the tendency of secularism, as the term implies, is to look wholly to this world for the standards and sanctions of morality. Consequently in every State believers in Christianity are exposed, both negatively and positively, to attempted interference with their conscientious rights on the part of the State. It cannot but be so. If we have two masters and they do not rule us in conscious harmony with each other, we are bound to be exposed to contradictory orders. If one ignores the other completely, and acts as if unaware of the other's jurisdiction over the same set of people, the first requirements for harmony are obviously absent, and, though there may be, *de facto*, no clash of legislation between them, this can be attributed only to a happy accident. Accordingly, the Catholic Church, which alone has always consistently claimed to be separate from and, in the moral order, superior to the civil authority, is of necessity exposed, under present conditions, to various forms and degrees of opposition in her work, ranging from persecution unto death in Russia to various legal and social disabilities in this country. The secularist State claims to rule alone—a claim which is essentially unjust on the plain ground that its citizens have a wide range of rights which do not derive from it and are therefore exempt from its intervention. It is the practical ignoring of these rights in the matter of international war that I wish to speak here.

It will, I think, be generally agreed that war under modern conditions, *i. e.*, waged by nation against nation, with weapons of tremendous destructiveness, and excluding *nothing*¹ that would give one side an advantage over another, inflicts such injuries even on neutrals that it can hardly any longer be morally justified. That is the conclusion de-

¹If a war on the scale of the last ever breaks out again, it is certain that in the course of it, as in the last, there will be a progressive deterioration of morality, so that whatever humanitarian restrictions are now adopted will be on one pretext or another ultimately swept away.

liberately arrived at, in his valuable treatise, "The Church and War" (1929), by Father Stratmann, O.P., who considers that, short of the immediate need of repelling actual aggression, aggrieved nations have no interests so important as to warrant recourse to war, with all its evil consequences, to secure them. The means, although not intrinsically evil, has become so closely and inevitably bound up with every form of iniquity that it is debarred by Christian morality. Now, let us notice this. What the moralist has decided on religious grounds, practically *all the nations of the earth, led by America and France, have agreed to*, on grounds both humanitarian and economic. By universal consent under the Kellogg Pact *war as an instrument of national policy has been finally and definitely abolished*, and the nations are pledged *never* to seek the solution of any disputes *except by pacific means*. Consequently, and this is a point of cardinal importance which has been strangely overlooked, the citizens of every nation have now a right to exact from their rulers the thorough implementing of this Pact to which they have agreed, and to refuse to support them in any course which assumes its invalidity or non-existence. The Kellogg Pact, embracing, as the League does not, the United States and Russia, marks the dawn of the new order, which regards war as wholly brutal, foolish, anachronistic, and according to which the various peoples, secured at last from aggression by universal agreement, can rightly expect to order their lives. Alas! the proceedings hitherto of the Disarmament Conference have shown them that their vital interests are not safe in the hands of their representatives, and that they themselves must exert themselves if they want their solemn engagement to have done with war to be made effective.

The Conference began at Geneva on February 2, and, although it may be galvanized into activity in the present session which opened in the middle of June, its former proceedings have thrown grave doubts as to its real will for peace. For six weeks its "expert" committees have discussed the distinctions between offensive and defensive weapons, and finally issued reports which, when not mere platitudes, seem to be dictated by merely national requirements, and to reach no agreed conclusion on points of importance. In fact, the reports of the Land, Naval, and Air

Committees would, were not the occasion so serious, provide material for high comedy. The various delegates have simply striven to retain under the defensive category those weapons which their respective Governments wish them to retain, and have paraded their general agreement in such *dicta* as these: "All artillery can be used for offensive and for defensive purposes"; "[the gun's] offensive capacity becomes greater as its effectiveness increases . . ., *i. e.*, with the increase of its power and its range"; "chemical substances, and appliances for releasing them, can only be described as weapons and means of warfare in virtue of the use that is made of them," and so on. And because aircraft carriers, which are used to transport swarms of lethal bombing-machines, are not *in themselves* combatant vessels, they must be reckoned as inoffensive! The fact is these committees of experts were not in the least contemplating a cessation of war and how best to bring it about. Their only business was to see that, if any weapons were to be abolished, their respective countries should continue to be as relatively strong as before.

However, the 'six weeks' discussion, as I have implied, has not been wholly wasted, as it has aroused and fostered a conviction amongst the nations that the establishment of world-peace is the concern of all citizens and cannot be left wholly to the politicians. These extra-official forces are gradually being marshalled. A considerable number of international organizations for peace are in existence, the activities of which become more and more marked. They made their voices formally heard for the first time shortly after the opening of the Conference, when on February 6 a whole day was devoted to the reception of petitions from societies, religious and secular, representing all nations and combining in the demand for something speedy and drastic in the way of disarmament. More recently there were two deputations to the Conference, urging the same view. One was from the "International Federation of Teachers' Associations," representing a membership of 625,000 in many different countries and including the French National Teachers' Union, 80,000 strong. But more significant still was the later deputation from the "National Federation of Ex-Service Men" of France, which presented a resolution carried in a conference representing 3,500,000 adherents, and

demanding reduction, not merely as a temporary measure of economy but as a settled and permanent policy.

These occasional demonstrations are becoming more frequent, but the most effectual work for peace outside the League is done by various international bodies, such as the "Union Catholique d'Etudes Internationales," to which the "Catholic Council for International Relations" in Great Britain and the "American Association for International Peace" are affiliated, the "Pax Romana," a widespread organization founded in 1921 for the development of Catholic culture, and incidentally for promoting the "Peace of Christ," which has lately extended its range to America, North and South; the "International Peace Bureau," which organizes yearly Congresses, the "Inter-Parliamentary Union," federating for common action the national groups of thirty-six Parliaments, the "Women's International League for Peace and Freedom," which has now twenty-six national sections, the "Rotary International," very widespread though not always satisfactory in principle from the Catholic standpoint, and the "War-Resisters' International," with which Professor Einstein is connected and which takes up the erroneous standpoint of absolute pacifism. Then, of course, there are different Labor organizations—"The Christian Trade-Union International," of which an account was given in a recent issue, the "International Federation of Trade Unions," and the (Second) Labor and Socialist International, which is Socialist, though not Communist, in spirit and aim—all societies which have the material interests of the worker mainly in view, but which are keenly interested in the peace movement. Moreover, there are literally hundreds of local organizations with the same object, scattered through the different countries, of which the powerful U. S. "National Council for Prevention of War" and the British "League of Nations Union," with nearly a million members, are outstanding examples. Few of these are Catholic in their inspiration: several even are definitely non-Catholic in moral principle, but their multiplicity, their extent and their activity indicate two things,—that the modern citizen is increasingly aware that the prevention or occurrence of war depends ultimately on him, and that he is increasingly determined to have no more of it.

The point now is to inquire whether his attitude under

present conditions calls for and deserves the whole-hearted support of the oldest and greatest of all international organizations, the Catholic Church. Without presuming to settle the question definitely—a function which belongs to the authorities of the Church—let us examine more thoroughly the reasons why people are beginning to hold that amongst the rights of the individual which the State may not justly invade, should now be included the right to refuse military service, except in the case of resisting armed aggression.

Many people have settled the question for themselves. The Society of Friends, for instance, are debarred by their religious tenets from taking up arms, even for defence of country, and, although a small body numerically, I believe that during the late war, even the U. S. Government, particularly ruthless in the matter, did not attempt to force them to do so or to subject them to civil disabilities in consequence. But, outside that body, conscientious objectors to military service meet with no tolerance from the modern State. Speaking quite generally, no plea of conscience is admitted in conscript countries to excuse men from that duty. All Governments *de facto* claim the right of calling on the male citizen to take an active part in any war they happen to have declared: and, when war is declared, treat with exceptional severity those who refuse service on plea of conscience. Moreover, the Supreme Court of a nation which ranks itself as the most enlightened and tolerant of all, the United States, has lately declared by a majority that, according to the U. S. Constitution, no one can be even admitted to formal citizenship who will not pledge himself beforehand to support the State by arms in whatever war it may be waging. Clearly, this is either a declaration that America will never wage an unjust war, or an assertion of the immoral doctrine that, even if she actually does, all Americans are bound to help her. The case is a clear, if indirect, assertion of State Absolutism, an illustration of the encroachment of Cæsarism on the moral domain, and as such merits the attention of all sociologists, Catholic or otherwise. The decision was pronounced in the Supreme Court on May 25, 1931, after nine judges had examined the pleas for admission to citizenship advanced by Dr. Douglas M. Macintosh, of Yale Divinity School, and

Miss Marie A. Bland. The former would not "promise in advance to bear arms in defence of the United States, unless he believed the war to be morally justified," and the latter wished to qualify the terms of the oath with the words, "As far as my conscience as a Christian will allow." Five judges held that these reserves made the applicants unfit for citizenship, whilst four, amongst them Chief Justice Hughes, dissented. It would seem that this extraordinary decision, which flies in the face of that fundamental tenet of Christianity, first enunciated by the Apostles when they said, "We must obey God rather than men," was a, perhaps unconscious, protest against the efforts of certain American ultra-pacifists to get the State, which had already proved so lamentably weak and wrong-headed in the matter of alcoholic drink, to prohibit war in the same way. Or the judges may have been swayed by the notion, contrary though it be to all experience, that to admit the right of the citizen to scrutinize and perhaps condemn the policy of the State in declaring war would lead to anarchy. Or they may have really been actuated by the Hegelian doctrine of entire State supremacy, and the Austinian notion that law derives its sole validity from force. However, there it is. The highest lay tribunal in America has implicitly declared its ultimate norm of morality to be that of the Russian, Mexican, and Spanish atheist—"My country, right or wrong."²

All genuine Christians, whether Catholics or not, must cry out against this usurpation of the rights of conscience, which are founded on the natural law itself and are antecedent to all organized religious beliefs, and I believe the decision will give a great impetus to the universal demand for the abolition of war. It is, as I have said, already acted on by the secularist State, especially in countries where, through the law of conscription, the citizen in peace time is drilled in the art of fighting. In such countries resistance is growing. A certain Belgian, Camille Lejeune, who holds Quaker views, was condemned last year by a War Council to be conscripted—a sentence which elicited a letter of protest from several international pacifists, such as Messrs. H.

²Naturally anxious that Catholic doctrine on the matter should be accurately expressed, the American National Catholic Welfare Conference issued a statement defining conscience as "a consistent, informed judgment, based on certain and definite principles founded on the divine and natural law and logically supported by the spiritual beliefs of the individual." This would exclude all merely intellectual or emotional reasons for refusing military service.

G. Wells and R. Rolland. And this example has proved infectious. How, in the light of the character of modern war and the fact of the Kellogg Pact, does it stand morally? Although as Catholics we insist upon the duty of the citizen to risk both fortune and life in the service of the State³ when the State is unjustly exposed to violation of its vital interests, we cannot, I think, unreservedly condemn the conduct of those who hold that, war being manifestly so prolific in moral and material evil and so rarely to be wholly justified, they are morally bound to discourage its survival, *especially as the world has now, in arbitration, another and better means of securing international justice, and especially as the world has now formally, officially and universally renounced war as an instrument of national policy.* In other words, the citizen who considers the Kellogg Pact a valid and authentic instrument cannot be blamed for taking his stand on it and saying—"no war, therefore no conscription!" To those who urge constitutional agitation with the view of promoting appropriate legislation, he may well reply: "the need is urgent and dramatic disobedience, which injures no one but myself, is the best form of agitation." It is the way chosen, *de facto*, by many in America to procure the repeal of the unjust law of Prohibition.

Accordingly our treatises of moral theology, when dealing with this question must, I think, henceforth take explicit cognizance both of the Kellogg Pact and of the World Court of International Justice, and declare that, in view of the existence of these new entities, it is at least probable that one of the conditions of a just war, viz., the impossibility of finding other means of redress, is now definitely ruled out. Already, as we have seen, Father Stratmann has spoken in that sense. And another eminent German theologian, Bishop Schreiber, of Berlin, at the eighth Congress of the "Freidenbund deutscher Katoliken" (November, 1913), did not hesitate to declare that, since modern warfare has become such a horrible disaster, inflicting the greatest evils on all the belligerents, no war can any longer be considered just. Moreover, the manifest unwillingness of the official repre-

³"The natural law" [apart, i.e., from Christianity], writes Leo XIII in *Sapientiae Christianae*, "bids us cherish with a love of predilection and devotion the country of our birth or nurture, even to the point of not fearing, as good citizens, to meet death for our fatherland." This is, of course, in direct contradiction to the false internationalism favored by Mr. Wells and others.

sentatives of the various States effectively to take the Kellogg Pact as the basis and background of their efforts to procure peace, would seem to justify the common citizen in taking the matter out of their feeble hands, especially as non-official action seems to be the only way left whereby to give continued strength to those same hands. Catholics may rightly quote the repeated exhortations of Popes Benedict XV and Pius XI as indicating that the time has come to banish war and war-preparation for ever from human affairs. It is by the laws of charity rather than by those of justice that international intercourse must be governed, especially as the common interests of the whole human family are so much more important than those that are sectional, real and genuine though these are, that they cannot rightly be left out of consideration; and the chief of those general interests is that mutual regard for just rights which constitutes peace.

The question of conscription, that evil legacy left to Europe by the imperialist Napoleon, concerns mainly France, Italy and Poland. It was forbidden to Germany by the Versailles Treaty in order to obviate that country's "aggressiveness." It is strange that it has not been mentioned at the Disarmament Conference, although its abolition would tend strongly to the establishment of peace. "Abolish conscription," said Sir Ian Hamilton, "and you break the teeth of war." It is surely reasonable in post-war Europe, Europe of the League and the Kellogg Pact, to cease to keep alive the mentality of war by forcing able-bodied male citizens to adopt, for however short a time, the profession of arms. Such a policy is not necessary to promote patriotism, and, as I have urged, it is questionable whether patriotism, sane love of country and its best interests, should nowadays include fighting for those interests except—what must always be excepted—to repel sudden and unjust aggression. I cannot see, therefore, that a conscientious objector to conscription should rightly be treated as a traitor, especially if he is willing to show his love of country in other ways. Nor can I conceive any better way of serving one's country than by doing all in one's power to promote the mentality of peace. Such, I am glad to note, are also the conclusions of an able article, on "L'Objection de Conscience," in our contemporary, *La Cité Chrétienne* (May 5, 1932), where the author, M. Henri Nicaire, suggests that an alternative to military

service should in the circumstances be provided for those who consider it, as they justly may, both evil and unnecessary. Their point of view deserves respect, not punishment. . . .

It is confidently hoped that, in the next General Council, that the Catholic Church will clearly define the moral limits, under modern conditions of cooperation in war. For outside the Church, the individual conscience has no adequate support. It advances one view against another, and neither can claim certain truth. Therefore it is the Church, with her gifts of inerrancy in morals, which ultimately stands for the rights of conscience against the encroachments of Cæsarism in every land. It is she who vindicates the integrity of the family, parental rights in education, the essential equality of woman. The individual conscience, unsupported by assured Christian tradition, has scant hope of tolerance from State absolutism. The very rule of right order and spirit of social life—that the interests of the individual should, *to a certain extent*, yield to those of the community—are pushed to all extremes, except where the organized and intrepid action of the Church insists upon the limits to be respected. Accordingly, as long as the secular State does not believe in the claims of the supra-national Church—in other words, as long as it remains secular—it will oppose, through ignorance or hatred or fear, this the only check upon its arbitrary omnipotence. Even though the Church is the champion of essential human liberties, knowing that oblivion of the rights of man follows denial of the rights of God, the desire of the State for economy, speed and efficiency in administration, and the tyranny to which majorities are prone, will always tend to override her claims. So much is manifest in human history, and never more so than at present.

And now the Church, led by the Vicar of Christ, is calling upon the nations to work together for the establishment of the Peace of Christ. And the citizen, who would speedily reject any Government which did not preserve order in his own community, is demanding, with the Church's approval, the establishment of order in the world at large. He sees his rulers in the grip of mistrust and fear, paying lip-homage to the ideal of peace yet thinking always in the terms of war. He sees vast vested interests concerned in the propagation of

war, uncontrolled by any sense of morality, aiding Russia to arm against Christian civilization, helping to prolong the miserable Sino-Japanese conflict, ignoring altogether the interests of humanity in the one desire to secure their dividends. He sees a nationalistic Press preaching racial hatred at the spur of racial pride. What wonder that his conscience revolts against all this greed and folly and hypocrisy, and that he insists on his rulers keeping to their word? No sincere Christian can have any esteem for the job-lot of After-Christians, Tolstoyans and atheists who are promoting the War-Resisters Movement here and abroad, but in this one point—the determination that mankind shall be set free from the incubus of war and preparations for war—they are in complete harmony with the spirit of Christ.

I have been conscious, when writing the above, of the inevitable question—What about Russia? So long as that mad attempt to construct a stable and successful society without the foundation of religion and the cement of moral principle, endures, I freely own that there is an obvious limit to the disarmament of the civilized nations. They must be prepared to unite for the defence of Christendom. But the Soviet experiment is foredoomed to failure, which will come the sooner if "Christian" Europe and America cease to supply it with arms, and if the anti-Christians in our midst would come to realize its essential inhumanity. Moreover, Russia too has signed the Kellogg Pact, and can be required to disarm like the rest: indeed, as far as professions go, it is ready to disarm completely. And, however it be with its present tyrannical rulers, the vast masses of its population are thoroughly peaceful. Russia must, no doubt, be kept in mind, but drastic reduction of armaments is still possible in spite of that menace.

To sum up. If the Disarmament Conference does not succeed, that failure will be a sign that the various Governments are not sincere in their purpose to abolish war or too weak to accomplish it. In either case, it will become the duty of their citizens to insist on their sincerity and to strengthen their weakness by multiplying those unofficial activities which are already so numerous and earnest. Knowing the evil, moral and material, of which is the necessary source, knowing the existence of substitutes for war, knowing the solemn pledge taken by his rulers in his name

never to pursue national interests by means of war, the ordinary citizen may well make refusal to engage in war, or in preparation for war, a matter of conscience, with which the State should not interfere. And I do not see that Christian morality can dispute his view.

Is War Justifiable?

An opinion delivered by a group of Catholic Professors of Theology assembled in Freiburg.

“FORMERLY, when there was no legal basis for a community of nations and when, consequently, every state was wholly independent in its activities, it was thought that a war declared by those who wielded supreme authority in any state could be looked upon as morally justifiable, provided that the necessary conditions were present. The older treatises of moral theologians regarding the permissibility of war usually were based upon this past situation.

“Now, however, when because of the growth of international relations and their regulation by law, the natural solidarity of the people should find legitimate expression more in accord with reason, the question may well be raised as to what extent such a purely circumstantial justification of war can be upheld.

QUESTION OF SOVEREIGNTY

“An answer to this question demands a clear grasp of the following: (1) What is meant by State sovereignty? (2) Under what conditions can the State today, by virtue of its sovereignty, declare war?

“I. The sovereign rights of States. Many jurists and statesmen of our day consider the State autonomous. Without recognition of any higher court, therefore, the State may decide whether its rights have been violated or not; it is free to recognize only those obligations which it has voluntarily assumed; it may refuse to accept any limitation or law not dictated by its own will and power.

“Altogether different is the supreme power of the State in the eyes of Christian philosophers. The latter consider

State sovereignty to be that moral power which a State possesses in order to accomplish whatever is essential to the well-being of its people.

"Since the State itself is a society and can attain its aim only as a member of the community of nations, the Christian philosopher concludes that the sovereignty of the State, in its international aspect, is not synonymous with unconditional independence but means independence of action only insofar as in this direction the various government measures in various fields further the common good of nations.

PERMISSIBILITY OF WAR

"II. The question of the permissibility of a war. To prove the permissibility of a declaration of war, one must consider whether one's step is feasible, taking into consideration the various legal remedies of society as a whole and, in the final analysis, whether it meets the true interests of mankind. In other words: The question whether war is permitted must today find its solution in the answers to the following two questions:

"1. Can a war which any State declares by virtue of its sovereignty under present circumstances be considered as an enterprise justified by natural law?

"2. Under what circumstances would war be permissible in case of legitimate self-defense?

"I. War on the ground of declaration by a single State. Although the community of States has not yet acquired that power which should belong to it as a natural as well as a positive right, there is no doubt but that it already has taken on legal character and is supported by a succession of legal and political agreements which strive for the establishment of international order and, consequently, of peace.

"Under these circumstances the war that a State declares in its plenitude of power, without previously consulting the existing recognized agencies of peace, would no longer be a rightful procedure. In its very origin such a war would injure the universal as well as the legal justice which demands of the State not only that it do nothing contrary to the rights of other States, but that it subordinate its own national aim to the community of nations.

"So much less can modern law have value as a social

remedy; that is, what we of today understand and experience under war. For modern war, because of its machinery of destruction, brings in its wake enormous material and spiritual evils to the individual, the family, society and even to religion. Modern war has become such a dreadful world catastrophe that it ceases to be a fitting means for the attainment of its ends—order and peace.

WAR OF SELF-DEFENSE

"II. The war of self-defense. The war of self-defense must first of all be distinguished from 'case of necessity.' Case of necessity, in the opinion of the modern jurist, exists when a State cannot protect its vital interests without war and, therefore, cannot achieve its national aims. But since this necessity doctrine presumes an unlimited State sovereignty, it comes to pass that under this cloak every enterprise of an exaggerated, strong and ambitious nationalism is considered permissible. In direct contrast to this misleading and dangerous theory stands the traditional teaching whereby rightful self-defense represents a totality of measures, including force, and is only admissible when a higher authority has failed to defend the right. Under such conditions it is permissible to meet force with force. Even then the right is not given to conduct a punitive expedition against the aggressor, nor the right to turn to war as a lawful means with the intention of having the ordeal of arms decide the justice of the quarrel between the attacker and the attacked.

"For an act may be morally permissible without being productive of right and especially without creating a lawful basis for a new order of international relations.

"Hence, one can confidently predict that the case of permissible self-defense in the international life will become rarer the more the mutual defense of the States and a court of arbitration assures true security.

"Therefore, although anxiety concerning a threatening danger here and there is still perceptible; nevertheless, it seems that there is no sufficient reason for the States to maintain the present unreasonable condition of armed peace. Their safety should rest not upon armed might, but upon a true union of peace."